



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MORE FROM OUR AGNOSTIC FRENCH SOLDIER

SIR,—In hand your copy of February. Let me firstly thank you for printing my letter in your number of December last. It brought me very interesting letters from America, and specially one of apparently a workman, from which it seems that things are not going to the general satisfaction of all the minds, as he insisted on my writing again.

I thank also Mr. J. Carter for taking the trouble to answer me. I would have liked more precision in his answer. That I have seen but two methods of conceiving the beginning of the world does not mean that there are no others. But I am yet waiting to be shown the others; and in his letter, Mr. J. Carter shows very clearly that he adopts one of these methods, that of the creation—what does he say?—"There are those who conceive of an existence whom they worship as God, who has been originating and maintaining in being what we call matter . . ." What did I say?—"or . . . an immaterial and eternal Something that we name God created . . . that matter." Where is the difference? I should be the wonder of the ages if I could answer my question: Why did God create the world? But does not Mr. Carter answer that question with a great precision? He says: "They perceive in the universe about us the evidence of intelligent design. They are inclined to be skeptical as to the assertion that there can be thought without a thinker or design without a designer." I never asked so much! If Mr. Carter knows that there is a design in the world and will explain that design, I am quite ready to take it as an answer to my question, "why did God create the world." Of course, I take for granted that Mr. Carter does not mean by "design" the arrangement of the things such as we see them simply, for then any haphazard jolting of things would be a design; but that that arrangement has a precise and well defined aim. The world-design would have no meaning without it. Well, if Mr. Carter does know that aim, he will have answered my wondering question.

In the end of his letter, Mr. Carter touched a subject on which I want also to say a word. He tells us that war has turned multitudes indifferent or deficient to the God of the Gospels. Well, that is a very curious effect of war in America. But after living in the middle of French and English soldiers for more than two years, my opinion (time will show if it is right) is that we shall have the biggest growth of free thinking and socialism ever seen in history.

The effects are already visible, at least in France. But to understand it quite well it must be understood clearly that religion is a very different thing in Latin and Anglo-Saxon countries. From what I have seen and read, an Anglo-Saxon mind never questions the existence of God. But he will most probably take a quite individual view of what he reads in the Bible and try to conform his life to the texts he likes best. Hence, an infinite number of sects. The Latin mind is very different. He jumps at once at extremities. If he believes in God, he is quite glad to accept the precepts of the established church and won't much bother about texts he has never read. But as soon as he begins to doubt, the primordial question of the existence of God presents itself implacably to his mind and nine times out of ten he jumps headfirst into atheism. Religion and politics are so closely allied here that it is almost impossible to be a socialist and go to church.

It follows that the idea of God is more and more weakening with the loosening of the grip that the Catholic church had on public business—and

that grip has been loosening very quickly since I was a boy, that is since 40 years. The church where I went as a youngster, where I was christened, was full then at the Mass and Vespers. It is pitiful to see it now. And it is a small country church, the same old priest (who is nearly 80) is there yet, and the number of the inhabitants passed from 1,800 to 2,200. The first real blow came with the separation of the church and the state. Up till then, priests had been paid by Government. As they got a good living, the priests were in sufficient numbers. But as soon as people had to pay out of their own pocket for religious services, it was seen very soon that they did it very reluctantly. On the other side, seminarists were to go in the army like all other young men, and that broke many vocations. The result was that at the beginning of the war, there were many country parishes without priests. Now the war sent to the army all the priests of military ages; and, although they were mostly put in the hospitals (which occasioned many a bitter comment) lots of the younger ones went to the front and were killed like ordinary soldiers. The young men being under the military age of 18, it has put a stop to the recruiting of the young students, so that after the war there will be a great lack of priests.

As for saying that the war turns unbelievers into believers, I will believe it when I have seen it. But till now I have not seen it. And I have been speaking daily with soldiers since the war broke out.

Let me end by thanking you, Mr. Carter, and the other American people who wrote me for the part they take in our struggle. Since it is possible (as I write) that you may be drawn in it, the opinion of those who wrote before is the more dearer to me.

(Sig.) M. QUESNEY.

CLINIQUE LA PRIMEVÈRE, LEYSIN, SWITZERLAND.

[We reproduce our friendly correspondent's somewhat Gallicized English as he wrote it, save for the correction of one or two obvious inadvertences. His impression that "an Anglo-Saxon mind never questions the existence of God" is perhaps unduly trustful.—EDITOR.]

A PRO-ALLY GERMAN-AMERICAN

SIR,—We all know it is by no means exceptional for foreigners to look upon the United States as an "international hash"—as a country without a past. At present we read so much in our newspapers about America being "the melting pot"; we hear so much from our politicians about British-Americans, German-Americans, etc. (and so little about Americans), that we almost begin to believe the foreigners may be right after all. To us who have fondly believed there was such a thing as America and Americans, this comes as a terrible shock. What reaches our ears most frequently is the assertion that those Americans whose ancestors came from Great Britain are naturally pro-Ally, while those whose ancestors came from Germany (no matter how long ago) are naturally pro-German. If this is true then there is really ground for the allegation that America is an "international hash." To an Englishman or to a Frenchman all countries but his own are foreign; he likes some better than others, but only because their characteristics please him better and not because his ancestors came from it. If the majority of Americans cannot stand this test then we are a "political hash." Happily,